

Methodology Step 2:

Operational Behavioral History

What has the Actor (individual or group/organization) done in the past ?

What are useful indicators in past behavior ?

What estimative value does the past behavior have ?

The Individual Actor

- Is violence a long, practiced behavior, or a recent development ? If recent, the cause ?
- Did the group/organization recruit him/her, or did the actor seek the group (pre-disposition)?
- Basis of violent behavioral tendency or choice: life experience, grievance, ambition (power, prestige, fame), “cause,” religious imperative, lack of alternative

The Group/Organization

- Was it “designed” for violence, or did it evolve into violence ? Gradual transition, or a triggering event ? (origin of group; see “Key Factors”)
- Is the group a self-defining, independent actor (criminal organization, gang, mercenary) or a “surrogate” for an ethno-linguistic group, ideology, sectarian element, separatist movement, counter-state insurgency ?

What we look for

- Trends (prevailing tendencies or inclination
 - evolution, consistency, or major change
 - when did violent behavior begin, and when and how did it change ?
- Patterns (observable behavioral acts, and their characteristics)
 - repeatability, and similarity (targets, means, methods, stated purposes)
- Anomalies: Do they occur; do they suggest a change in purposes, means, trends, and patterns ?

Sources

- OSINT: omnipresent, accessible, useful
 - news media (print, broadcast, internet); blogs; on-line forums; public statements; etc.
 - no two sources are equal in access, accuracy, perspective, and objectivity TEST !!
- Intelligence: the challenge is to drive collection with your analytical information needs; develop partnerships with the collectors
- Others who are there, observe, have access

Estimative value of past behavior

- For individuals, past behavior is a major component of future behavioral choice ~ 45%
- For groups, IF capabilities are similar, and the “cause”/purpose and objectives are continued, we may achieve a very good “analytical” estimative level of confidence
- Anomalies : always possible; yet “chaos” and randomness are different !!